



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/617,042  | 07/11/2003  | Yoshihiro Ishida     | 03560.003336.       | 3064             |
| 5514 7590 06/25/2008<br>FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO<br>30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA<br>NEW YORK, NY 10112 |             |                      |                     |                  |
| EXAMINER  |             |                      |                     |                  |
| YUAN, KATHLEEN S  |             |                      |                     |                  |
| ART UNIT  |             | PAPER NUMBER         |                     |                  |
| 2624  |             |                      |                     |                  |
| MAIL DATE   |             | DELIVERY MODE        |                     |                  |
| 06/25/2008  |             | PAPER                |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/617,042

**Applicant(s)**

ISHIDA, YOSHIHIRO

**Examiner**

KATHLEEN S. YUAN

**Art Unit**

2624

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) KATHLEEN S. YUAN.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Gary Jacobs.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 18 June 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: The applicant faxed in a proposed amendment.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Silverbrook.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner agreed if the applicant filed the newly proposed amendments as shown in the fax, that the amendment would overcome the current prior art rejection. Since the last rejection returned was a final rejection, the applicant asked if the examiner would consider the claims after final. The examiner stated that the amendments would not be entered because they would require further consideration/ search.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Bhavesht Mehta/  
SPE, TC 2600

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required